



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,156	10/28/2003	Paramjit Kahlon	OIC0097US	6587
60/975 7590 08/10/2011 CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758				
EXAMINER				
OBEID, FAHD A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3627				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/10/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/696,156

Applicant(s)

KAHLON ET AL.

Examiner

FAHD OBEID

Art Unit

3627

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 33-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 33-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1. This is in reply to communication filed on 06/23/2011.
2. Claims 37 and 38 have been added.
3. Claims 25-32 remain cancelled.
4. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, and 33 have been amended.
5. Claims 1-24 and 33-38 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1-24 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 9, and 33 recite the limitation “generating intermediate source inventory location information into the intermediate format comprises determining whether a record exists...if the record exists, accessing a common object... if the record does not exists, creating the record ...etc.” is vague and indefinite. As best understood by the examiner, the limitation shows that the record is created/updated in the intermediate source while several dependent claims show that the record is created/updated in the target source. It is unclear and confusing whether the

record is created/updated in the intermediate source or target source. Thus the limitation is not positively recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-24 and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880), and further in view of Katz (US 2002/0178077).

12. Regarding Claims 1-3, 9-11, and 33-38: Coleman discloses a computer implemented method comprising:

- synchronizing existing target information with source information, wherein the existing target information is stored in a target inventory location record at a target system, the source information is stored at a plurality of source systems, the plurality of source systems are ones of a plurality of computer systems, the target system is another of the plurality of computer systems, (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

The synchronizing comprises:

- extracting the source information from a plurality of source records (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),
 - at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a first source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),
 - at least one of the plurality of source location records is extracted from a second source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13),
 - the source information from each of the plurality of source records is in one of a plurality of source formats, and each one of the plurality of source formats corresponds to at least one of the plurality of source systems (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

- generating intermediate source location information by converting the source location information into an intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);
- converting the intermediate source information into target location information, wherein the target location information is in a target format, and the target format corresponds to the target system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13);

Coleman does not explicitly teach determining whether a target location record exists at a target system, if the target location record exists at the target system, updating the target location record with the target location information, if the target location record does not exist at the target system, creating the target location record at the target system and storing the target location information in the target location record.

However, Balgeman does disclose the following:

- wherein the converting the source inventory location information into the intermediate format comprises:
 - determining whether a record exists, wherein the record is associated with the source inventory location information,
 - if the record exists, accessing a common object, wherein the common object is associated with the record,
 - if the record does not exist, creating the record and the common object, the common object comprises the intermediate source inventory location information (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9);
- (claims 34 & 36-38) determining whether a target location record exists at a target system, if the target location record exists at the target system, updating the target

location record with the target location information, if the target location record does not exist at the target system, creating the target location record at the target system and storing the target location information in the target location record (C8 L54-60, claims 3, 6, 7, & 9);

While, Katz does teaches inventory location information (§¶ 39, 42)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Balgeman's and Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, for the advantage of providing a communication system which provides flexibility by allowing individual nodes to utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; C1 L66-67, C2 L1-2).

13. Regarding Claims 4 and 12: Coleman discloses a method of claim 1, wherein from the at least one of the plurality of source location records, the extracting extracts less than all first source location information, and from the at least one of the plurality of source location records from the second source system, the extracting extracts less than all second source location information (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

14. Regarding Claims 6, 20, and 21: Coleman discloses a method of claim 5, wherein each of the plurality of address elements comprises: an address identifier element; an address base

data element, wherein the address data cleansing data element includes a disable cleansing flag element; an address data cleansing data element; an address relationship data element; and an address custom data element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

15. Regarding Claims 7 and 22: Coleman discloses a method of claim 6, wherein the address relationship data element comprises: an address effective end date element; an address occupancy type code element; an address effective start date element; an address type code element; and an address list of roles element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, C1 L9-13).

16. Regarding Claims 5, 8, 13-19, and 23-24: Coleman substantially discloses the claimed invention. However, Coleman does not appear to explicitly teach hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements,

However, Katz disclose a method of claim 4, wherein the hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements, wherein each of the plurality of inventory location elements includes: an identifier for identifying the inventory location element; a base data element for defining: a location description; a location name; and a location type code; a list of addresses element for defining a plurality of address elements from a party class; a list of related business units elements for defining a plurality of business units associated with the inventory, and wherein each of the plurality of business units associated with the inventory includes an identifier element; a list of related inventory locations for defining a plurality of related inventory locations; and a custom data element for defining customized attributes for the inventory (§§ 39, 42, 43, 46, 54).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Katz's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: a) the cited references fail to disclose "wherein the converting the source inventory location information into the intermediate format comprises: determining whether a record exists, wherein the record is associated with the source inventory location information, if the record exists, accessing a common object, wherein the common object is associated with the record, if the record does not exists, creating the record and the common object, the common object comprises the intermediate source inventory location information".

In response to a) examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Balgeman teaches that subsequent updates of the record by any node are automatically distributed to the other nodes by utilizing a standardized record format (C8 L54-57). Balgeman further teaches automatically sending records stored in a first database that have been modified to other nodes which contain corresponding records thereby keeping corresponding records at other nodes updated (claim 6).

Labeling each record at its creation with a unique identification number which always identifies all corresponding records in other nodes in the communication system (claim 7).

Therefore, the combination of the cited references still meet the scope of the limitations as currently claimed.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627
August 8, 2011